

## **REMARKS**

**[0003]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 4, and 6-13 are presently pending. Claim amended herein is 1. New claims added herein are 12-13.

## **Statement of Substance of Interview**

**[0004]** Examiner Mitchell graciously talked with Michael D. Carter—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on October 22, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

**[0005]** During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited reference, namely Kraenzel. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

**[0006]** In the telephone discussion of October 22, 2008, Examiner Mitchell indicated amendments to the claims should be directed to subject matter in paragraphs [0028] and [0029] of the disclosure, and in particular, to the “drizzle download” of a subset of components of the application. Amendments are presented herein based on the discussion with the Examiner.

**[0007]** Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

## **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0008]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims and there only issues that remain are minor or formal matters, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0009]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

## **Claim Amendments and Additions**

**[0010]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claim 1 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited reference.

**[0011]** Furthermore, Applicant adds new claims 12-13 herein. These new claims are fully supported by Application and therefore do not constitute new matter.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 102**

[0012] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4 and 6-11 under § 102. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not shown that the cited reference anticipate the rejected claims.

[0013] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0014] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone:

- **Kraenzel:** *Kraenzel, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,742,026 (issued May 25, 2004);

### **Overview of the Application**

[0015] The Application describes a technology for elements that define the scope of an application, its startup and shutdown behavior, and how it manages windows and resources; provide basic navigation functionality, journaling and journal extensibility, browser integration, and Structured Navigation; and define the way an application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from the system in a secure, non-impactful way. It also enables using the same tools and languages for Web applications and locally installed applications, and allows the same application to be hosted in the browser or in a standalone window, based on a compile-time attribute.

## **Cited References**

[0016] The Examiner cites Kraenzel as the primary reference in the anticipation-based rejections.

### *Kraenzel*

[0017] Kraenzel describes a technology for a workflow, enterprise, and mail-enabled application server and platform supports distributed computing and remote execution of web applications. Lotus Domino online services (DOLS) is used by a web site administrator to configure Internet Notes (iNotes) clients to auto download from server, thus providing iNotes clients with web access using HTTP with various browsers, and with local processing and replication. A local run time model comprises a hierarchy of models including object data store model, security model, indexing model, replication model, agent workflow model and mail model. DOLS provides a layered security model that allows flexibility for controlling access to all or part of an application

## **Anticipation Rejections**

[0018] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.<sup>2</sup>

### **Based upon Kraenzel**

[0019] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraenzel. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0020] The Examiner indicates (Action, pages 2-3) the following with regard to claim 1:

---

<sup>1</sup> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

<sup>2</sup> See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 1, 4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Kraenzel et al.** (US 6,742,026 B1).

Claim 1

**Kraenzel** discloses a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an application framework for developing an application, comprising:

an application object that isolates the application from other applications or external resources, raises startup and shutdown events for the application, and manages application windows and resources (*figure 10; column 2, lines 20-28, web application*);

navigation components that provide navigation functionality by sharing a global state across a plurality of pages, journaling, journal extensibility, and structured navigation (*figures 14-21; column 5, lines 11-45, web enabled software*);

application lifecycle management components that define how the application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from a computing system (*figure 10, element 246; figure 11; column 37, lines 38-47; column 39, lines 15-32*);

a secure execution environment that defines a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment, and if the application requires permissions in addition to the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application (*column 39, lines 15-32, offline subscription denoting additional permissions and secure environment as well*); and

a component that defines a mechanism that allows the application to access common window properties of a hosting environment in a like manner regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window environment (column 39, lines 33-38, integrated into Windows, multiple offline subscriptions, thus for both browser and standalone).

**[0021]** Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an application framework for developing an application, comprising, an application object that isolates the application from other applications or external resources, raises startup and shutdown events for the application, and manages application windows and resources; navigation components that provide navigation functionality by sharing a global state across a plurality of pages, journaling, journal extensibility, and structured navigation; application lifecycle management components that define how the application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from a computing system; a secure execution environment that defines a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment, and if the application requires permissions in addition to the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application; a component that defines a mechanism that allows the application to access common window properties of a hosting environment in a like manner regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window



environment; and a manifest that specifies a first subset of components of the application as required, a second subset of components of the application as on-demand, and a third subset of components of the application as online, with the first, second, and third subsets of components of the application differing, with the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background as a user interacts with the application.

**[0022]** Kraenzel does not disclose or show "a manifest that specifies a first subset of components of the application as required, a second subset of components of the application as on-demand, and a third subset of components of the application as online, with the first, second, and third subsets of components of the application differing, with the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background as a user interacts with the application."

**[0023]** Rather, Kraenzel merely recites integration of Lotus iNotes Sync Manager with the Windows desktop and managing multiple offline subscriptions. See column 39, lines 33-38. The synchronization is merely between the online and offline versions of the application with each other. Furthermore, Kraenzel describes a web sync control that provides the synchronization with the browser. See column 12, lines 12-15. The web sync control merely displays an indicator showing that a user is looking at an online version or an offline version of an application page.

See column 19, lines 56-67. However, Kraenzel has no mention of the application having three subsets of components of the application categorized as required, on-demand, and online, much less that the on-demand components are drizzle-downloaded in the background as the user interacts with the application.

**[0024]** Consequently, Kraenzel does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

#### *Dependent Claims 4 and 6-11*

**[0025]** In addition to their own merits, dependent claims 4 and 6-11 are allowable for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 6-11.

#### *New Dependent Claim 12*

**[0026]** New claim 12 recites a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an application framework for developing an application, comprising, an application object that isolates the application from other applications or external resources, raises startup and shutdown events for the application, and manages application windows and resources; navigation

components that provide navigation functionality by sharing a global state across a plurality of pages, journaling, journal extensibility, and structured navigation; application lifecycle management components that define how the application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from a computing system; a secure execution environment that defines a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment, and if the application requires permissions in addition to the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application; a component that defines a mechanism that allows the application to access common window properties of a hosting environment in a like manner regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window environment; and a manifest that specifies a first subset of components of the application as required, a second subset of components of the application as on-demand, and a third subset of components of the application as online, with the first, second, and third subsets of components of the application differing, with the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background as a user interacts with the application, wherein the first subset of components are minimum code for the application to run in the hosting environment.

[0027] Kraenzel does not disclose or show "a manifest that specifies *a first subset of components of the application as required* [emphasis added], a second subset of components of the application as on-demand, and a third subset of components of the application as online, with the first, second, and third subsets of components of the application differing, with the second subset of components being drizzle-downloaded in the background as a user interacts

with the application, ***wherein the first subset of components are minimum code for the application to run in the hosting environment*** [emphasis added].”

**[0028]** Kraenzel is completely silent with respect to a subset of components of the application being minimum code for the application to run in the hosting environment. Consequently, Kraenzel does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim.

*New Dependent Claim 13*

**[0029]** In addition to their own merits, dependent claim 13 is allowable for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable.

## **Conclusion**

[0030] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

\_/Michael D. Carter/\_\_\_\_\_ Dated: /Oct. 27, 2008/

Michael D. Carter (michaelcarter@leehayes.com; 512-505-8164)

Registration No. 56661

Emmanuel Rivera (emmanuel@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 45760

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)